



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace

VOL. LXXX

JANUARY, 1918

NUMBER 1

HOW NOT TO WIN THE WAR

THE side in this war which bases its theory of victory upon the conquest of territory will lose. Whatever the attitude of nations in wars past, the voice of the world today is a new voice. We agree that the German conquest in Belgium, France, the Balkans, and to the east shall not be permanent. By the same token, territorial conquest by the Allies shall not by virtue of conquest be permanent. "The voices of humanity," to which the President referred in his message of December 4, are against such conquests as they are against the cut-throat theory of economic warfare typified by the proposals of the Economic Congress in Paris. It is true that "the voices of humanity" are in the air. It is true that "they grow daily more audible, more articulate, more persuasive, and they come from the hearts of men everywhere. They insist that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong." It is this thought that has been expressed in the formula, "no accessions, no contributions, no punitive indemnities." The attempt to end the war by accessions and punitive indemnities would not end the war, but prolong the war, or at least establish a temporary peace which would be but the forerunner of another and probably more terrible war.

The same thing is true of rulers, of empires, of the ambitions of dynasties. The subjection of a people or of peoples to the purpose of ancient ambitions for glory would spell defeat and only defeat for the nation that furthers it. This lesson must be learned not only by the Germans, but by the extreme Tory wing in England and by the seekers after special privilege everywhere. Lord Lansdowne's historic letter in which he expressed the opinion that with another year or two of war the whole of Europe would be in ruins, whoever wins, represented, among other things, we believe, the fear peculiar to ancient vested interests everywhere. It is increasingly clear that this war is not being waged for the perpetuity of the interests which made it possible, and to insist upon the reorganization of the world for the firmer re-establishment of these interests would mean a war fought in vain.

We shall not win this war by listening to the unofficial

utterances of German intriguers. When even the German Foreign Secretary, Dr. von Kuelhmann, says that it is "absurd to imagine Germany would enter a peace conference with large claims," or when he says that the claims for the present war rests upon the shoulders of the bureaucrats and sycophants surrounding the former Czar of Russia, he is saying nothing of interest to us. To listen to him when he is using such language is time thrown away. Again, we cannot listen to "feelers" by way of neutral governments. At the time of this writing "some one in Germany" is proposing the following formula: To leave the disposition of Alsace-Lorraine to a plebiscite of inhabitants; England to pay Germany for her lost African colonies and the money to be used for the rehabilitation of Belgium, Serbia, Roumania, and northern France; Russian provinces bordering the Baltic, the Black Sea and Prussia to become independent, under a German plan; Poland to be called an independent state under Austrian suzerainty; disarmament, freedom of the seas, and commerce to be left to the peace conference; Roumania, Serbia, and Montenegro to retain their original boundaries, with the right of access to the sea being granted to Serbia; Turkey to remain intact. But these words are not backed by the German people. There is no humility here, no sign that German militarism is ended. Such proposals reveal one of two things, desperation or political obtuseness—possibly both.

We shall not win this war even if Belgium, Poland, northern France, and Serbia are returned to the conditions before the war. We should not win this war were we to accept the suggestion of the Emperor of Austria-Hungary that we stop fighting on the basis including a guarantee of the integrity of Austria-Hungary. We cannot win this war by any means that will put a premium upon a repetition of German brutality. We cannot win this war by treating directly or indirectly with the present German autocracy. Any steps in the direction of militarism or vindictiveness are steps toward defeat, whether they be taken by the Central Powers or the Entente Allies, for such steps are steps away from what Mr. Balfour calls "the emancipation and security of Europe."

We cannot win this war by any inconclusive, fragile, or patched-up peace.

The peace of exultation of the strong over the weak, of exploitation and of revenge, of mere compromise, of

secret diplomacy or intrigue, of a subjection of small nations against their will, of greed and selfishness, or of any dicker with German war lords would be no peace at all.

HOW TO WIN THE WAR

THE first answer to the question, "How are we going to win this war?" is to be answered in terms of materials, of what the English call "goods and services." If the German Government is to be "brought to terms," the materials of America, by which we mean food, fuel, clothing, and munitions, must be produced and distributed with all the wisdom at our command. All this is under way and we believe that the work is for the most part being well done. In any event, there will be no turning back. We are pursuing no middle course. Whether our guns have reached our boys in France or not, our boys have guns. Other guns will be forthcoming. We are assured that the program for action outlined by the United States in conference with its associate governments is maturing substantially according to schedule. The big government machine improvised for this emergency has assembled its parts and they are in operation. In the unmistakable words of the President to the Congress, December 4: "Our object is, of course, to win the war; we shall not slacken or suffer ourselves to be diverted until it is won." We are about the business. We are going ahead with it. If this be what the American people desire, if we are out to overcome evil, if we are after the defeat once for all of the centralized forces that interrupted peace and now render it impossible, and if we believe these things to be the aim and purpose of the American people, we may be comforted to know that the job is being done.

But a mere military victory for the United States will not in and of itself mean the winning of this war. Mr. Wilson addressed the Congress at its opening session with great wisdom when he discussed the question, "When shall we consider the war won?" The war will be won when the "intolerable Thing" stood for by the Imperial German Government, "the menace of combined intrigue and forces . . . without conscience or honor or capacity for covenanted peace" is "crushed" or "at least shut out from the friendly intercourse of the nations."

Our opinion is that the President's address to the Congress, December 4, was largely misinterpreted by our people and by members of the Congress as well. The portions of the address which received the most praise are those portions which refer to our military victory. The most significant aspects of this great utterance, however, are those references to the ideals behind our great adventure. Repeating his position set forth in his letter

to the Pope, the President looks forward to the day when we can discuss peace with spokesmen vouched for by the German people. The President longs, as do all of us, for the establishment of "bases of law and of covenant for the life of the world." He said: "We shall be willing and glad to pay the full price of peace and pay it ungrudgingly. We know what that price will be. It will be full, impartial justice—justice done at every point and to every nation that the final settlement must affect, our enemies as well as our friends." When we attain unto this, and not until then, will this war have been won.

Nothing is to be gained by reminding our readers that the position of the President is the position held by the American Peace Society for nearly a century. There would be a certain cheapness in any self-gratulations that the President's message sets forth what is the substance of our editorial of last month, entitled "Win and End the War." The important thing is that the President of the United States has voiced the great principles upon which nations must be based. His utterance is more than the utterance of a single man, than of a single nation; it is the utterance of hopeful and intelligent men everywhere. The people of the world, Germany included, must be "put in control of their own destinies." "Autocracy must first be shown the utter futility of its claims to power and leadership in the modern world." When the "intolerable Thing" is "crushed," we shall be free and attain peace, the peace of generosity and justice to the exclusion of all selfish claims and advantage even on the part of the victor. The prime elements in the winning of this war are therefore three in number: (1) The German people; (2) Justice; (3) Reparation. "We shall regard the war as won only when the German people say to us, through properly accredited representatives, that they are ready to agree to a settlement based upon justice and a reparation of the wrongs their rulers have done." No one can say that the United States has no formula for ending this war. The wrong to Belgium must be repaired, the power that Germany has over Austria-Hungary, the Balkan States, Turkey, and within Asia "must be relinquished." By this, "We intend no wrong against the German Empire, no interference with her internal affairs." The President says, again, that we are not fighting the German people: "We are in fact fighting for their emancipation from fear along with ourselves—from the fear as well as from the fact of unjust attack by neighbors or rivals and seekers after world empire." Again, we are told of the President's conception of a "partnership"—a partnership which "must be a partnership of peoples, not a mere partnership of governments." With such a partnership as a result of this war, the war will have been won.

It is certain that we of America are now at war with